

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,871	03/28/2001	Bipin Mukherji		1054
759	90 05/07/2003			
Matthew F. Jodziewicz, Esq. Suite 836 3660 Wilshire Boulevard			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, TU T	
Los Angeles, CA 90010			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2877	
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003	l .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	[Applicant(a)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summan	09/819,871	MUKHERJI, BIPIN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
TI MANUNO DATE SALI	Tu T Nguyen	2877
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed /s will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	— · is action is non-final.	
/ <u>-</u>		respection as to the morits is
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under I Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		
5) Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-21</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement	
Application Papers	olookon roquii oliionk	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accep	ted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exa	miner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	see 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disappro	oved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	ly to this Office action.	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicat	ion No
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	visional application has been rec	ceived.
Attachment(s)	5 phoney under 55 5.5.5. 33 120	- with the fi
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Trademark Office		

Serial Number: 09/819,871

Filing Date: 03/28/01

Paper No: 6

Detailed Office Action

Claim Objections

Claim 21 is a duplication of claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3,11, lines 3-4, the phrase "said video based coordinate measuring system" is not clear. Does applicant means "measuring the position of the video based on a coordinate measuring system"?

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

1

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polidor et al (6,518,996).

With respect to claims 2,10,18, Polidor discloses a compact video inspection system.

The system comprises: a moveable carriage for supporting a sample, a movable optical system i.e a video (column 1, lines 5-40).

Polidor does not explicitly disclose a base and a video monitor. Since Polidor discloses a movable video and a movable carriage, Polidor inherently discloses a base so that the video and the carriage to be mounted on and Polidor also inherently disclose a video monitor to display the image.

Polidor does not disclose the carriage which can be moved vertically. However, it would have been obvious a design choice to modify Polidor's carriage to move vertically to adjust the sample easier. The modification involves only routine skill in the art.

With respect to claims 3,11,21, Polidor does not disclose measuring the position of the video. However, measuring a position of an object would have been known. It would have been obvious to modify Polidor's system with the known coordinate measuring system to control the location of the video more accurate.

With respect to claims 4-7,12-15,18-20, Polidor does not disclose a feed, a lock, a

carriage feed, a carriage lock mechanisms. However, the claimed limitations would have been known. It would have been obvious to modify Polidor's system with the known claimed limitations to make the system more accurate.

With respect to claims 8-9,16-17, since Polidor discloses a video inspection (abstract), Polidor inherently discloses the light source. Further, the skill artisan would have been motivated to modify Polidor's system with a plurality of lights to illuminate the object with different angles.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 is allowed.

The prior arts of record does not disclose a precision video gauging machine which comprising all the limitations which structurally arranged and functionally operated as claimed in claim 1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9185. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G Font can be reached on (703) 308-4881. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular

communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Tu T. Nguyen Primary Examiner Group Art Unit 2877

5/2/03